

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

225 Franklin Street
Boston, Massachusetts
02110-2804

Telephone
617 542-5070

Facsimile
617 542-8906

Web Site
www.fr.com

Date January 28, 2010

To Chirag R. Patel
Patent Examiner

Facsimile number 04838-007700001 / 571-273-7966

From Elliott J. Mason, III

Re U.S. Serial No. 10/720,742
F&R Ref. No.: 04838-0077001

Number of pages
including this page 4

Message

NOTE: This facsimile is intended for the addressee only and may contain privileged or confidential information. If you have received this facsimile in error, please immediately call us collect at (617) 542-5070 to arrange for its return. Thank you.

Approved for use through: 07/31/2008. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/720,742 First Named Applicant: Lawrence W. Yonge, III
Examiner: Chirag R Patel Art Unit: 2141 Status of Application: Pending

Tentative Participants:

(1) Elliott J. Mason, III (2) Frank Gerratana
(3) _____ (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: TBD Proposed Time: TBD (AM/PM)

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO
If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>103 Rejections</u>	<u>1, 2, 4</u>	<u>Heer, Alapuranen, Cimini</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Continuation Sheet Attached	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

Please see the attached sheet for a summary of questions to be asked for the issues listed above.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.
NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

/Elliott J. Mason, III Reg. No. 56,569/

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Elliott J. Mason, III

Examiner/SPE Signature

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative
56,569

Registration Number, if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Questions for interview in Office Action of 11-06-09

Serial No: 10/720,742

Docket Number: 04838-077001

103 rejection of claim 1

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that Heer discloses "at least some of the low level data units containing boundary demarcation information indicating boundaries between the sub-frames in the stream." In particular, the Examiner points to col. 14, lines 31-54 of Heer, describing "The VL PDU segment header 910 of a segment which has not been completely transmitted within a subframe boundary provides total segment length information about its associated PDU segment payload 911. The total length in this illustrative example is shown to traverse the subframe boundary 920 and the remainder of the PDU segment payload 911 is transmitted in the subsequent subframe as PDU segment payload 922."

On pages 3-4 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that Cimini discloses "at the MAC layer, encapsulating content from a plurality of the high level data units into a stream of sub-frames." In particular, the Examiner points to col. 3 line 51-col. 4 line 2 of Cimini, describing "The MPDU 50 includes a variable length body 52 encapsulated by an MPDU header 54 and a Frame Check Sequence (FCS) 56. The body 52 corresponds to the MSDU."

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that Alapuranen discloses "supplying low level data units...at least some of the low level data units each containing a plurality of the pieces into which the encapsulated stream was divided." In particular, the Examiner points to paragraph [0029] of Alapuranen, stating that "physical layer packet equated as a low level data unit" and "physical layer packet which can consist of single or multiple segments in a data stream."

(Q1) What disclosed in Heer does the Examiner believe is equivalent to the "low level data units" of claim 1? Is it the PDU segment, the PDU segment header, the PDU segment payload, the subframe, or some other construct or combination of these?

(Q2) What disclosed in Heer does the Examiner believe is equivalent to the "boundary demarcation information" contained in a low level data unit of claim 1? Is it information contained in one of the items listed in question 1, or something else?

(Q3) The Examiner identifies the physical layer packet of Alapuranen as a low level data unit. Claim 1 requires that each low level data unit contains a plurality of the pieces into which the encapsulated stream of sub-frames is divided. What would have led a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Alapuranen such that the "multiple segments" that are included in a physical layer packet are pieces into which an encapsulated stream of sub-frames was divided, given that the "encapsulation" described in Cimini refers to encapsulating a body between a header and a frame check sequence?

103 rejection of claim 2

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that Cimini discloses "wherein at least some information common to the high level data units is not repeated for each high level data unit encapsulated in the stream." In particular, the examiner points to Col. 3, line 51 – Col. 4, line 2 of Cimini, describing "the MPDU 50 may have the capacity to contain an entire MSDU 52 or only a fragment of the MSDU 52."

(Q1) What disclosed in Cimini does the Examiner believe is equivalent to the "high level data units" and "information common to the high level data units" of claim 2?

103 rejection of claim 4

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that Cimini discloses "the high level data units each comprise a payload, and encapsulating comprises forming the stream comprising the payloads from a succession of high level data units." In particular, the examiner points to Col. 3, line 61 – Col. 4, line 2 as well as Figure 3, item 60 of Cimini.

(Q1) What disclosed in Cimini does the Examiner believe is equivalent to the "stream comprising the payloads from a succession of high level data units" of claim 2?